

NO.

82-1820

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

MAY 6 1983

ALEXANDER L. STEVENS,  
CLERK

IN THE

# SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

CAROL DUERR,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF OHIO,

Respondent.

On Writ of Certiorari to the Court  
of Appeals for the First Appellate District  
Hamilton County, Ohio

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO  
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

H. FRED HOEFLER  
1010 Second National Building  
830 Main Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
(513) 241-1268  
Attorney for Petitioner

OPPOSING COUNSEL:

ARTHUR NEY  
Hamilton County Prosecutor  
420 Courthouse  
1000 Main Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

## **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

- I. WHETHER A CONFESSION TO A MURDER CONSPIRACY IS CONSTITUTIONALLY ADMISSIBLE UNDER THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS WHERE IT IS THE RESULT OF THE COALESCENCE OF MANY FACTORS WHICH RENDERED IT INVOLUNTARY: THE PROLONGED DETENTION OF PETITIONER; HER ILLNESS, LACK OF SLEEP, LACK OF NOURISHMENT, HER UNFAMILIARITY WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM AND THE LEADING, EVEN ORCHESTRATION OF HER STATEMENT BY THE INTERROGATING OFFICER.
- II. WHETHER AN ATTORNEY MAY INVOKE THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCrimINATION ON BEHALF OF HIS CLIENT BY TELEPHONICALLY CONTACTING THE POLICE STATION DURING HER STATEMENT AND DEMANDING THAT FURTHER QUESTIONING CEASE.

**PLEASE NOTE:** All parties to the within action are named in the caption. A companion case, Catherine Duerr v. Ohio, is being separately filed on behalf of Petitioner's daughter, who is indigent.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>QUESTIONS PRESENTED .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>AUTHORITIES CITED .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>PETITION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>OPINIONS BELOW .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>JURISDICTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
 <b>I. The Confession admitted against petitioner was extracted in violation of her privilege against self incrimination secured to her by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Con- stitution of the United States, in that it was the product of a coalescence of practically every factor previously condemned by this court as unduly contributing to the making of an in- voluntary confession .....</b>	<b>6</b>
 <b>II. It is important that the court decide whether an attorney may invoke the privilege against self incrimination on behalf of his client who is, at the time of the invocation of the privilege, then being interrogated by the police .....</b>	<b>9</b>

IV.

	Page
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	12
<b>APPENDIX A – OPINION OF THE COURT OF APPEALS</b>	1a
<b>APPENDIX B – DECISION OF THE OHIO SU- PREME COURT, DENYING REVIEW</b>	19a

<b>Cases:</b>	<b>Page</b>
<i>Ashcraft v. Tennessee</i> (1944), 322 U.S. 143 . . . . .	8
<i>Chambers v. Florida</i> (1940), 309 U.S. 227 . . . . .	7, 8
<i>Culombe v. Connecticut</i> (1961), 367 U.S. 568 . . . . .	7
<i>Escobedo v. Illinois</i> (1964), 373 U.S. 478 . . . . .	10
<i>Fikes v. Alabama</i> (1957), 352 U.S. 191 . . . . .	8
<i>Leyra v. Denno</i> (1953), 347 U.S. 556 . . . . .	8
<i>Malloy v. Hogan</i> (1964), 378 U.S. 1 . . . . .	6
<i>Payne v. Arkansas</i> (1957), 356 U.S. 560 . . . . .	7
<i>Reck v. Pate</i> (1961), 367 U.S. 433 . . . . .	7, 8
<i>Rogers v. Richmond</i> (1961), 365 U.S. 534 . . . . .	6-7
<i>Spano v. New York</i> (1959), 360 U.S. 315 . . . . .	6, 7, 8
<i>Tibbs v. Florida</i> (1982), -- U.S. --, 102 S.Ct. 2211.	10
<i>Watts v. Indiana</i> (1949), 338 U.S. 49 . . . . .	7
<b>Rules:</b>	
Evid.R. 801 (D) (2) (e) . . . . .	3
<b>Constitutional Authority:</b>	
Fifth Amendment, U.S. Constitution . . . . .	2, 6
Sixth Amendment, U.S. Constitution . . . . .	2, 12
Fourteenth Amendment, U.S. Constitution . . . . .	3, 6, 12
<b>Statutes:</b>	
Ohio Revised Code 2903.01 . . . . .	3

IN THE  
**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**  
OCTOBER TERM, 1982

---

NO. ....

---

CAROL DUERR,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE STATE OF OHIO,

Respondent.

---

On Writ of Certiorari to the Court  
of Appeals for the First Appellate District  
Hamilton County, Ohio

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO  
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

---

**PETITION**

Petitioner, Carol Duerr, respectfully petitions the Court for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment and decision of the Court of Appeals for the First Appellate District, Hamilton County, Ohio, affirming her conviction for the crime of aggravated murder.

## OPINIONS BELOW

The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the First Appellate District of Ohio, rendered November 17, 1982, is unreported and appears as Appendix A to this Petition, *post*. at p. 1a. The decision of the Ohio Supreme Court refusing review of this case on March 9, 1983, is appended hereto as Appendix B.

## JURISDICTION

The final order of the Supreme Court of Ohio denying review herein was rendered March 9, 1983. This Petition is timely filed and jurisdiction is founded on 28 U.S.C. 1257 (3), Petitioner having asserted below and in this Court a denial of rights secured to her by the Constitution of the United States.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

### FIFTH AMENDMENT, UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

No person . . . shall be compelled in a criminal case to be a witness against himself, . . .

### SIXTH AMENDMENT, UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury . . . to be confronted with the witnesses against him; . . . and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

## FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

Section 1. . . . No state shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.

## OHIO RULES AND STATUTES:

### OHIO RULES OF EVIDENCE, RULE 801 (D) (2) (e)

(D) *Statements which are not hearsay.* A statement is not hearsay if . . .

(2) Admission by party-opponent. The statement is offered against a party and is . . . . (e) a statement by a co-conspirator of a party during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy upon independent proof of the conspiracy.

### OHIO REVISED CODE:

Section 2903.01 *Aggravated murder.*

(A) No person shall purposely, and with prior calculation and design, cause the death of another.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner, Carol Duerr and her daughter, Catherine Duerr, were indicted and convicted, along with Dennis Goerler, of the aggravated murder of Raymond Duerr in the Court of Common Pleas of Hamilton County, Ohio. Their convictions were affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the First Appellate District. The Ohio Supreme Court declined to review the case on March 9, 1988.

\* \* \*

On May 19, 1981, Raymond Duerr, an engineer for the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., was discovered dead on the

floor of the bedroom he shared with his wife, Petitioner, in their home in Anderson Township, a suburb outside of the City of Cincinnati. Mr. Duerr's body was discovered by his wife at approximately 8:00 P.M., after she, her daughter Catherine, and Catherine's boyfriend, Dennis Goerler, had returned to the residence after shopping and visiting Petitioner's parents. The police and life squad responded, and Petitioner and Catherine were briefly interviewed by police that night.

The following day, W. Stewart Mathews, II, a Cincinnati, attorney, contacted the Sheriff's office on behalf of Petitioner, his client, with respect to securing the return of Mr. Duerr's checkbook and other personal items taken by the police and/or life squad members when Mr. Duerr's body was removed. An appointment was made for Petitioner to report to the Hamilton County Sheriff's headquarters at 6:00 P.M. that evening.

Petitioner, Catherine and Goerler appeared at police headquarters as scheduled, having first dropped the Duerrs' other daughter, Mary Beth, off at her apartment in Fairfield. The two women and Goerler arrived at police headquarters at 6:00 P.M. on May 20, and at 7:00 P.M. Petitioner was interviewed until 8:45 P.M. Thereafter, Goerler was taken back, followed by Catherine. Both Goerler and Catherine gave statements in the early morning hours which implicated themselves and Petitioner in the slaying of Mr. Duerr. Petitioner was again taken back for questioning, and made a taped statement at 7:20 A.M., concluding at 8:10 A.M. The statements of all three were introduced against them by the state in each of their separate trials.

During Petitioner's statement, between 7:20 and 8:10 A.M., according to the defense, Petitioner's attorney, alerted

by Mary Beth Duerr that her mother and sister had been at police headquarters all night, called headquarters, and demanded that no statements be taken and that any interrogation cease. Mathews maintained that he called shortly after 7:45, when Petitioner's statement was being taken; Captain Henke of the Sheriff's office, admitted taking the call, but indicated that the statements had been concluded at the time Mathews called.

The three were jointly indicted for the aggravated murder of Mr. Duerr. A bill of particulars filed by the state alleged that Goerler was the triggerman, and was alone in the house when Mr. Duerr was shot; the two women were alleged to have been co-conspirators with Goerler, but were charged as principals.

Prior to trial, all three defendants had a joint hearing on motions to suppress statements filed by all three. The trial court denied the motions to suppress, which were principally based upon the prolonged detention, lack of sleep, meals and medicine, and illness suffered by the respective defendants, and the Duerrs had further alleged that they were denied the right to counsel as well.

During the two separate trials of Petitioner and her daughter, the prosecution introduced the statements despite the fact that there had been no testimony concerning the cause of death of the victim, over objection by the defense that the *corpus delecti* had not yet been established, as is required by Ohio law. Statements by the codefendants were also admitted over objection, the trial court in each instance ruling that the statement by Petitioner constituted "independent" evidence of the conspiracy so as to justify the admission of such statements.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

- I. THE CONFESSION ADMITTED AGAINST PETITIONER WAS EXTRACTED IN VIOLATION OF HER PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF INCRIMINATION SECURED TO HER BY THE FIFTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, IN THAT IT WAS THE PRODUCT OF A COALESCENCE OF PRACTICALLY EVERY FACTOR PREVIOUSLY CONDEMNED BY THIS COURT AS UNDULY CONTRIBUTING TO THE MAKING OF AN INVOLUNTARY CONFESSION.

When Petitioner, her daughter, and Goerler appeared at Sheriff's headquarters at 6:00 P.M. on the day after her husband's murder, Petitioner had had almost no sleep for two days; her confession was begun at 7:20 A.M.; she had had nothing to eat but one half of a cold, greasy hamburger; she was ill; she was led through her statement as it was committed to the tape recorder; and Petitioner was totally unfamiliar with the criminal justice system.

The test of the admissibility of a confession is whether it is voluntary, not whether it is true or false, *Spano v. New York*, 360 U.S. 315 (1959). The Fifth Amendment privilege against self incrimination is binding on the states through the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, *Malloy v. Hogan*, 378 U.S. 1 (1964).

The test of voluntariness, in turn, is whether the behavior of law enforcement, in conjunction with the other facts and circumstances surrounding the giving of the statement, was such as to overbear the will to resist and to bring about confessions not freely self-determined, *Rog-*

*ers v. Richmond*, 365 U.S. 534 (1961). Through the years, this Court has condemned several factors which have given rise to involuntary confessions. Most of those factors are present in this case, and it is the coalescence of these factors which constitutes the basis for this constitutional claim.

**1. Prolonged detention.** Petitioner was at the police station from 6:00 P.M. on May 20, 1981 continuously until 7:20 A.M. on May 21, when her taped statement commenced, approximately thirteen hours after her arrival at headquarters. This Court has decided many cases where prolonged detention prior to the giving of a confession was condemned as a contributing factor in an involuntary confession: *Spano v. New York*, *supra*; *Culombe v. Connecticut*, 367 U.S. 568 (1961) [12 hour detention]; *Chambers v. Florida*, 309 U.S. 227 (1940). Ironically, in *Chambers*, the accused also was held from the afternoon of May 20 to the early morning hours of May 21, and the result was the same as here: an involuntary "sunrise" confession.

**2. Lack of nourishment.** Petitioner had only half a greasy hamburger to eat while she was at police headquarters for thirteen hours. Lack of nourishment has also been recognized by the Court as a factor contributing to involuntary confessions, *Watts v. Indiana*, 338 U.S. 49 (1949), *Payne v. Arkansas*, 356 U.S. 560 (1957), *Reck v. Pate*, 367 U.S. 433 (1961).

**3. Lack of Sleep.** Lack of sleep has often been cited by the Court as another factor in the making of involuntary confessions, *Watts v. Indiana*, *supra*, where the Court held that disregard for the rudimentary needs of life, opportunities for sleep and a decent allowance of food, are relevant, not as aggravating elements of the suspect's treat-

ment, "but as part of the total situation out of which his confessions came and which stamped their character," 338 U.S. at 53. See also *Chambers v. Florida*, *supra*, *Leyra v. Denno*, 347 U.S. 556 (1953). Lack of sleep and the fatigue resulting therefrom was the basis for the Court's holding a confession involuntary in *Ashcraft v. Tennessee*, 322 U.S. 143 (1944). The lack of sleep is perhaps the most significant factor in the weakening of one's resistance and resolve. Its effects are both physical and mental and contributed significantly to the decision of Petitioner to make the statement which ultimately resulted in her conviction and life sentence.

**4. Illness of the Suspect.** Physical and mental illness also is a significant factor in the determination of the voluntariness of confessions, *Reck v. Pate*, *supra*. It is uncontradicted that Petitioner was ill on the night of her interrogation, suffering from stomach and kidney ailments (R. 300-301); the detective assigned to "chaperone" Petitioner confirmed that Petitioner complained of illness, fatigue and hunger, and that she used the bathroom quite frequently (R. 421, 427-8).

**5. Leading question and answer statement.** Petitioner's statement was basically a series of responses to factual allegations supplied by the interrogating officer. Such a statement has been condemned by this Court as a hallmark of an involuntary statement, *Spano v. New York*, *supra*, *Fikes v. Alabama*, 352 U.S. 191 (1957).

All of these factors are present to some degree in this case. Petitioner's statement was the involuntary product of the coalescence of these factors. Illness, fatigue, unfamiliarity with the ways of crime and its detection, a statement of responses rather than volunteered facts — all are present here and all establish the involuntariness and un-

constitutionality of Petitioner's confession. It was secured from and used against her in violation of the privilege against self incrimination and the due process clause. Her conviction should be reviewed and reversed.

**II. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE COURT DECIDE WHETHER AN ATTORNEY MAY INVOKE THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF INCRIMINATION ON BEHALF OF HIS CLIENT WHO IS, AT THE TIME OF THE INVOCATION OF THE PRIVILEGE, THEN BEING INTERROGATED BY POLICE.**

Petitioner Carol Duerr had contacted Cincinnati attorney W. Stewart Mathews II shortly after Mr. Duerr was killed, and on the next day, May 20, Mr. Mathews had spoken with several Sheriff's deputies indicating that he represented Mrs. Duerr. He arranged for Petitioner to present herself at headquarters at 6:00 P.M. that evening to secure the return of Mr. Duerr's checkbook and other personal belongings. Of course, when she left headquarters she was in custody, having given a statement and having been charged with the aggravated murder of her husband.

This issue is presented because Mr. Mathews maintained that he had called headquarters at approximately 7:45 A.M., during the taking of Petitioner's statement (from 7:20 to 8:10) and demanded that questioning cease. Captain Henke told Mathews that the statements had already been taken, and stated that he would give Petitioner a message to call Mr. Mathews. Henke maintained that, when Mathews called, the statements had indeed been completed. The Court of Appeals accepted the trial court's

assessment of credibility in favor of Henke and ruled that there was no constitutional issue presented.

While it is true that the issue claimed by Petitioner here turns on a question of credibility, we contend that the credibility question should have been resolved in favor of Petitioner and against the prosecution. Appellate courts can, should, and do, assess credibility of witnesses on occasion, *Tibbs v. Florida* (1982), — U.S. —, 102 S.Ct. 2211.

The reason that Petitioner's contention is correct is that Henke indicated that he did give her the message to call Mr. Mathews, and the evidence shows that she did call Mathews after her statement was concluded, after being advised by Captain Henke to call her attorney. The state's only witness at the motion to suppress, Detective Bennett, testified that he saw Petitioner on the phone with Mr. Mathews, and spoke with Mr. Mathews himself. He testified that the call was made "a very few minutes" after her statement was concluded at 8:10 A.M. (R.M. 343). Consequently, it is impossible for Henke to have taken the call from Mathews after the statement was concluded, then told Petitioner to call her attorney, and after she had been photographed and fingerprinted, for her to then make the call within "a very few minutes of her statement, as Bennett confirmed.

Of course, when an attorney representing a suspect demands that questioning cease, a constitutional problem under *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 373 U.S. 478 (1964), presents itself. The Court of Appeals did not reach this question, resolving the factual dispute against Petitioner. [We should add at this point that Petitioner and her daughter both testified that they demanded counsel prior to the making of their statements, and that they were denied the right

to consult with counsel. The police denied that such a demand was made; of course, the courts below resolved this conflict against appellants as well.]

The only reasonable construction of Bennett's testimony is that Mathews necessarily had to have called during the taking of Petitioner's taped statement. It further appears that the police claim that they believed that Mathews represented Petitioner only with respect to her husband's estate is incredulous. A person who consulted an attorney to secure the return of miscellaneous personal items from police was not believed by them to have intended to consult an attorney when accused of aggravated murder, and they further denied that she asked for counsel even when she became aware of the seriousness of her predicament. Certainly the sum of human experience teaches that one who has retained an attorney for a minor matter would, and did, insist on consulting that attorney when she learned but a day later that she was accused of aggravated murder, the most serious crime since the dawn of civilization.

The right to counsel is a principal guarantee against the overreaching of police in the gathering of confessions. One who consults with counsel can more reliably determine whether his interests will best be served by cooperating and discussing the offense with law enforcement authorities. Certainly, one's attorney, whose sole task is to speak for and to represent his client, should be permitted to invoke the privilege against self-incrimination on behalf of his client; Petitioner's attorney made such an attempt here, and the only rational interpretation of the facts compels the conclusion that he called the police and demanded that questioning cease while the statement of Petitioner was even then being obtained. As it is impossible to determine

exactly at what point in the statement the attorney called, then the entire statement should be ruled inadmissible.

Petitioner's statement was extracted from her in violation of her right to counsel secured to her by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments and its use against her at her trial is grossly unconstitutional.

### **CONCLUSION**

In a few brief pages, we have enumerated the several constitutionally infirm factors which coalesced to render Petitioner's statement involuntary, and thus constitutionally inadmissible. Each of the several factors has been condemned by this Court in prior cases; yet in no one of those great cases were so many of such factors present as are present here. The brief listing of the factors and of the cases in which this Court has condemned their presence cannot adequately convey the effect of the *combination* of those factors on Petitioner and on the decision to waive her right to silence and to counsel and to give a statement. The significant aspect of this case is the coalescence of so many of the condemned factors, each interacting with and reinforcing the others, with the conclusion rendered inescapable that the combination of these factors, the "totality of the circumstances," resulted in an involuntary confession being extracted from Petitioner. Clearly the denial of the motion to suppress such statement is constitutional error of the first magnitude.

As to whether Petitioner waived the right to confer with counsel, Petitioner denied below and denies here that she waived the right to counsel. But we must concede that the trial court and the Court of Appeals resolved the credibility question against Petitioner; nevertheless, the factors

cited as having combined to produce an involuntary confession also combined to produce an involuntary waiver of the right to counsel as well, even if the incredible version of law enforcement in this case is to be fully credited. The Court is respectfully urged to review this case, to reverse the judgment below, and to remand with instructions to provide Petitioner with a new trial at which her tape recorded confession and any and all oral statements leading up to it are not used in evidence against her.

Respectfully submitted,

H. FRED HOEFLER  
1010 Second National Building  
830 Main Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
(513) 241-1268

Attorney for Petitioner

## **APPENDIX A**

---

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO  
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

---

**NO. C-810761**

---

**STATE OF OHIO,**

**Plaintiff-Appellee,**

**vs.**

**CAROL DUERR,**

**Defendant-Appellant.**

---

### **OPINION**

**(Filed November 17, 1982)**

---

### **APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

Messrs. Simon L. Leis, Jr., William E. Breyer, Arthur M. Ney and R. Thomas Moorhead, 420 Hamilton County Courthouse, Court and Main Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, for Plaintiff-Appellee,

Messrs. Wm. Stewart Mathews, II and James M. Rueger, 1300 American Building, 30 East Central Parkway, Cin-

cinnati, Ohio 45202, and Mr. H. Fred Hoefle, 1010 Second National Building, 830 Main Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202, for Defendant-Appellant.

*PALMER, P.J.*

The defendant-appellant was indicted on a charge of aggravated murder of her husband, Raymond Duerr. Indicted with her on the same charge were her daughter, Catherine Duerr, and Dennis Goerler. Separate trials were requested and granted. In due course, an evidentiary hearing was held on the defendant's motion to suppress, heard by stipulation along with similar motions by the other two defendants, and the motion was overruled. The matter then proceeded to trial by jury, at the conclusion of which the defendant was found guilty as charged and was sentenced as appears of record. Appeal was timely filed, with three assignments of error raised for review, considered here in the order of presentation.

For her first assignment of error, the defendant asserts that the trial court erred in denying her motion to suppress an inculpatory statement said to have been involuntarily given and to have been extracted in the absence of appellant's attorney. This assignment of error may be said to proceed in two parts: first, defendant argues that the length of time she spent at police headquarters, her state of health, both mental and physical, and the circumstances of her ultimate confrontation by police after they had first secured inculpatory statements from Catherine Duerr and Dennis Goerler, all combine to deprive the statement she made to police of its voluntary and knowing nature, requiring — it is argued — its suppression. Second, the defendant argues that the statement was taken from her after she requested and was denied the assistance

of counsel, and, in any event, after the police were aware of the fact that she was represented and that her counsel was attempting to reach her. For the reasons hereinafter set forth, we find neither argument to possess merit.

As to the first argument under this assignment of error, we simply find nothing in the record which would compel or require the conclusion of the trier of fact that the statement was taken under circumstances which, by virtue of their coercive, unduly suggestive, or other improper nature, deprived defendant's statement of its voluntary character. The defendant points, in support of her thesis, to her prolonged detention, her inexperience with the criminal justice system, her argued lack of nourishment and sleep, and her asserted physical illness, together with what is urged to have been the suggestive nature of the interrogation.<sup>1</sup> Yet the record convincingly demonstrates that from the time defendant arrived at the police station until she was actually implicated in the crime, she was under no suspicion of complicity and under no restraints.

Thus, defendant and her two companions arrived at police headquarters at 6:00 p.m. on May 20, 1981. They were seated in a general lounge area until the defendant was called for an interview that lasted from 7:00 to 8:45 p.m. After the interview, defendant returned to the lounge area and remained there until Dennis Goerler and Catherine Duerr implicated her during the early morning hours of the 21st. During this period, she made and received a number of telephone calls, left the station unaccompanied

---

<sup>1</sup> We refer to the companion case of *State v. Goerler*, No. C-810778, released this day, for a recital of the sequence of events that marked the questioning and interrogation of the parties on the evening of May 20th and early morning hours of May 21st, as well as the events preceding this period of questioning.

to purchase medicine for Goerler, went to the restroom several times, was served food by the police, and spent most of the balance of the time in the lounge area of the station with immediate access to the outside. Not until first Goerler and then the defendant's daughter actually implicated the defendant did what may be called a custodial interrogation commence, at about 6:30 a.m. It was at this time that the defendant was advised of her constitutional rights, and at about 7:20 a.m. that she made the inculpatory statement in question. We conclude that, under the totality of circumstances, the trial court had before it ample credible evidence from which to conclude that the statement at issue was made voluntarily and knowingly. *State v. Edwards* (1976), 49 Ohio St. 2d 31, 358 N.E.2d 1051, *vacated on other grounds* (1978), 438 U.S. 911, 98 S. Ct. 3147.

The second argument under the first assignment of error deals with whether or not defendant's constitutional right to counsel was violated. This argument consists of two points: first, the defendant claims she asked for the assistance of counsel during the interrogation process and was told she did not need it. This was flatly denied by the officers involved in the questioning. Some independent confirmation of the police position is supplied by the numerous telephone calls made by the defendant during the evening, none of which were to the counsel with whom she had conferred about estate matters earlier in the day, and who represented her interests.<sup>2</sup> In any event, a clear

---

<sup>2</sup> It seems clear that the police were aware that defendant's counsel, William Stewart Mathews II, represented her in her presumed capacity as administratrix of her husband's estate, since Mathews had contacted the Sheriff's office during business hours on the 20th to inquire about the return of personal property of the deceased held by that office or the coroner. It is not contended that the authorities knew

question of credibility was presented to the court, which it resolved against the defendant. We know of no reason why it was not within the power of the court to do so. *State v. DeHass* (1967), 10 Ohio St. 2d 230, 227 N.E. 2d 212.

The second aspect of this argument concerns a telephone call to the station made sometime on the morning of May 21st by the defendant's attorney. It is agreed that such a call was made and received, and that the attorney was told that interrogation of the defendant had already ceased because her statement had been completed. It is further agreed that the defendant's statement was completed at about 8:10 a.m. The problem arises from testimony adduced on behalf of the defendant that the call was made to the station shortly after 7:45 a.m., which would obviously have been before the statement had been completed and would, if accurate, raise the constitutional problem addressed in *Escobedo v. Illinois* (1964), 373 U.S. 478, 84 S. Ct. 1758, and *Edwards v. Arizona* (1981), 451 U.S. 477, 101 S. Ct. 1880. See also *State v. Burt*, C-790438 (1st Dist. May 14, 1980). An issue of fact was, however, presented to the trial court as to when this call was actually made. The officer who received the attorney's call, Captain Henke, the supervising officer in the investigation, testified quite positively that it was not made until after the defendant's statement had been completed, T.p. 172, which would necessarily place the call after 8:10 a.m.

---

then that Mathews was to represent her in criminal charges, or that Mathews had instructed them not to question her; indeed, at that time the defendant was not under suspicion, and no reason for such precautions could have arisen. It was not until an early morning call to Mathews by the defendant's daughter, Mary Beth, that he was aware of his client's possible jeopardy on criminal charges.

The defendant argues that we are able to, and should, find the trial court's adverse resolution of this factual dispute to be contrary to the manifest weight of the evidence. This would require, obviously, that we discount Captain Henke's testimony on the timing of the call, and accept in its most favorable light that of Mathews, the defendant's attorney. He testified that he had received the call from Mary Beth Duerr alerting him that the defendant had been at the station all night at "approximately" 7:45 a.m. and that, after completing this call, he "immediately" called the station and spoke to Henke. T.p. 261, 262. It would also require that we discount the thrust of his testimony that the defendant returned his call at "approximately 8:10 or 8:15 a.m.," *after* she had finished her statement and the subsequent fingerprinting and photographing. T.p. 262, 267, 268. We find no justification, under these circumstances, for substituting our judgment on the issue for that of the trier of facts, and decline to do so.

The first assignment of error is accordingly overruled.

The defendant's second assignment of error argues that the trial court erred in overruling her objection to the introduction of her inculpatory statement into evidence where, it is insisted, there had been insufficient evidence of the *corpus delicti* first established. While the rule urged by the defendant, *viz.*, that some evidence of the death of the victim, and a criminal agency as the cause of that death, must precede the introduction of a confession by the defendant, is a correct one, *State v. Maranda* (1916), 94 Ohio St. 364, 114 N.E. 1038, it is equally clear that:

The quantum or weight of such additional or extraneous evidence is not of itself required to be equal to proof beyond a reasonable doubt, nor even enough to make a *prima facie* case.

*State v. Edwards* (1976), 49 Ohio St. 2d 31, 358 N.E.2d 1051, syllabus 1c. As noted by Chief Justice O'Neill in *Edwards, supra* at 35-36, 358 N.E.2d at 1056.

Considering the revolution in criminal law of the 1960s and the vast number of procedural safeguards protecting the due process rights of criminal defendants, the *corpus delicti* rule is supported by few practical or social-policy considerations. This court sees little reason to apply the rule with a dogmatic vengeance.

In considering the minimal requirements of *Maranda* and in evaluating the evidence in the light of the ordinary customs of our times, we conclude that the prosecution did produce *some* evidence tending to corroborate the material elements (of the crime).

*See also State v. Black* (1978), 54 Ohio St. 304, 376 N.E.2d 948. Here, the record reveals that substantially more than "some" evidence of the *corpus delicti* preceded the introduction of the inculpatory statement of the defendant. The first witness, a co-worker of the deceased, testified that Mr. Duerr was alive at shortly after 5:00 p.m. on May 19, having spoken to him about then. He further testified that he was told by the defendant the following morning that Mr. Duerr had been shot the preceding evening. He then verified photographic exhibits, subsequently received into evidence, one of which was a morgue photograph of the deceased clearly showing the bullet wound in the deceased's head. The second and third witnesses, neighbors of the Duerr's testified that on the evening of the 19th, the defendant told them that her husband had been shot. The second witness testified that the defendant told him she thought her husband was dead. The fourth witness, a paramedic, examined the body, found no respiration or heartbeat, and then described the

trauma to the head of the deceased. The sixth witness, Lt. Hulgin, examined the scene at 9:45 p.m. on the 19th, and described finding decedent's blood stained wearing apparel on the stairway, other blood stains on the bathroom doorjamb, a spent cartridge casing lying on the floor, and the body of the deceased in his bedroom. He further testified that he found a bullet hole in the bedroom wall, and blood on the blanket on the bed along with another spent cartridge casing. All of the foregoing testimony preceded the introduction of the statement of the defendant and was ample, we conclude, to establish the *corpus delicti* under the *Edwards* and *Black* rationale. *State v. Latscha*, C-800844 (1st Dist. Nov. 18, 1981). The second assignment of error is without merit and is overruled.

The third assignment of error is phrased as follows:

The trial court erred to the substantial prejudice of the defendant-appellant by admitting into evidence statements of alleged co-conspirators without first establishing the conspiracy by independent proof, or were [sic] not made infurtherance of the conspiracy.

The reference in this assignment to "statements of alleged co-conspirators," it must be understood, does *not* refer to the formal taped confessions of Dennis Goerler and Catherine Duerr. Their confessions implicated the defendant in a conspiracy of the three to kill Raymond Duerr, and were taken during the early morning hours of May 21st. Both confessions preceded (and caused) the custodial interrogation of the defendant, resulting in her inculpatory statement, which ended at 8:10 a.m. These taped confessions of Goerler and Catherine Duerr were never offered or received into evidence, although referred to in passing, from time to time, primarily to establish the change in status of the defendant from mere witness to prime suspect,

requiring as to her the full panoply of constitutional instructions. Rather, the assignment of error must be held to refer to various statements made to witnesses by Goerler or Catherine Duerr, or actions taken by both, but principally Goerler, generally prior to the homicide. These statements, too lengthy to set out in detail herein but which are explored on pp. 39-42 of the appellant's brief, were introduced into evidence *after* the court received into evidence the confession of the defendant. The defendant's position may fairly be summarized by the following statement of her argument:

However, in the case at hand, the Court allowed statements made by alleged co-conspirators before a conspiracy had been established, before any independent proof had been offered concerning said conspiracy, and from a review of the record, it can be seen that the only evidence that a conspiracy ever existed or that the alleged co-conspirators and Defendant-appellant were involved, was the hearsay statement of Defendant-Appellant, which was admitted in the State's case in chief and which is not independent proof required by the Rule and the case law previously cited (emphasis added).

Appellant's Brief, pp. 38-39.

The "Rule" to which reference was made in the quotation above, and upon whose interpretation this aspect of the issue raised in the third assignment of error depends, is Evid. R. 801 (D) (2) (e), which provides:

(D) *Statements Which Are not Hearsay.* A statement is not hearsay if: . . .

(2) Admission by party-opponent. The statement is offered against a party and is . . . (e) a statement by a co-conspirator of a party during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy *upon independent proof of the conspiracy* (emphasis added).

Unless the inculpatory statement<sup>3</sup> of the defendant may be said to constitute "independent proof" of the conspiracy, the defendant is quite correct that the statements of the co-conspirators would not fall within Evid. R. 801 (D) (2) (e) and would thus be inadmissible hearsay, since no other proof of the conspiracy exists in the record. We simply disagree with the defendant that the statement of the defendant, which concededly gave substance to the charge of a conspiracy of the three, was not such "independent proof" of the conspiracy as would satisfy the requirements of the rule.

Thus, while the point appears to be one of first impression in Ohio, we are instructed by a variety of decisions interpreting the federal analogue of the Ohio rule, Fed. R. Evid. 801 (d) (2) (E). It will be noted that while the federal rule does not contain an explicit requirement that there be independent proof of the conspiracy, as found in the Ohio rule, the requirement of independent proof has nevertheless been engrafted onto the federal rule by case law interpreting the section. These cases follow the reasoning in *Glasser v. United States* (1941), 315 U.S. 60, 74, 75, 62 S. Ct. 457, 467, that without proof *aliunde* of the conspiracy, "hearsay would lift itself by its own boot straps to the level of competent evidence." One statement of the rule was made in the following fashion:

Cambindo argues that the court admitted hearsay evidence that did not fall under the coconspirator exception to the hearsay rule, Fed. R. Evid. 801 (d) (2) (E), in that certain statements were admitted into evi-

---

<sup>3</sup> This is improperly characterized by the defendant as "hearsay;" of course, it is not. Evid. R. 801(D)(2)(a) quite clearly excludes from hearsay those statements offered against a party consisting of his own statements.

dence prior to a decision as to the declarant's status as a conspirator. The law is well settled in this circuit that declarations that are otherwise hearsay may nevertheless be provisionally admitted, subject to eventual connection of the defendant with the conspiracy alleged, as long as the trial court is ultimately satisfied that the participation of the defendant against whom the declaration is offered has been established by a fair preponderance of the evidence independent of the hearsay utterances. *United States v. De Fillipo*, 590 F.2d 1228, 1235-36 (2d Cir. 1979) (following *United States v. Geaney*, 417 F.2d 1116, 1120 (2d Cir. 1969), cert. denied, 397 U.S. 1028, 90 S. Ct. 1276, 25 L.Ed.2d 539 (1970)).

*U.S. v. Cambindo Valencia* (2nd Cir. 1979), 609 F.2d 603, 630. See also *U.S. v. Papia* (7th Cir. 1977), 560 F.2d 827; *U.S. v. Macklin* (8th Cir. 1978), 573 F.2d 1046; *U.S. v. James* (5th Cir. 1979), 590 F.2d 575; *U.S. v. Graham* (8th Cir. 1977), 548 F.2d 1302; *U.S. v. Williams* (8th Cir. 1976), 529 F.2d 557; *U.S. v. Sanders*, (8th Cir. 1972), 463 F.2d 1086. See generally M. Graham, *Handbook of Federal Evidence* § 801.25 (1981); 1 J. Weinstein & M. Berger, *Weinstein's Evidence* ¶104(05) (1982), where a review of the federal circuits holdings on the issue is listed at footnote 29.

We take it, therefore, that the Ohio rule, as expressed, and the federal rule, as interpreted, are substantially the same. It then becomes relevant to examine federal decisions dealing with the issue of whether a confession of conspiracy by a defendant will constitute evidence *aliunde*, or independent proof, sufficient to bottom out-of-court statements of co-conspirators. These authorities, we conclude, sustain the state's position that statements of the defendant probative of the existence of a conspiracy will suffice to furnish the independent proof of the conspiracy

requisite under the rule. Thus, in *U.S. v. Gallagher* (7th Cir. 1971), 437 F.2d 1191, the defendant argued that there was no evidence connecting him with his brother in a conspiracy to defraud, so that out of court statements of his brother and an unindicted co-conspirator could not properly have been used against him. The Court noted:

The flaw in appellant's argument which makes it inap-  
posite is that here the record discloses that there is  
independent evidence of appellant's connection with  
the conspiracy which serves to make the declarations of  
his brother . . . admissible against appellant.

*Id.* at 1193. The independent proof, noted the court, consisted of a number of inculpatory statements made by the appellant himself to various witnesses. Similarly, in *U.S. v. Cerone* (7th Cir. 1971), 452 F.2d 274, a case of conspiracy to use interstate facilities in aid of illegal gambling, the court framed the issued as follows:

Finally in this regard, defendants argue that it was error to admit the testimony of Bombacino as to extra-judicial declarations and acts of the defendants absent prior independent proof of the existence, scope and membership of the conspiracy. It is axiomatic that such declarations and acts of a co-conspirator may not be admitted in evidence against a defendant absent independent evidence establishing his participation in the conspiracy. E.g., *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. 60, 74-75, 62 S.Ct. 457, 86 L.Ed. 680 (1942); *Oltman v. Miller*, 407 F.2d 376, 378-379 (7th Cir. 1969); *United States v. Stadter*, 336 F.2d 326, 329 (2d Cir. 1964); cf. *Logan v. United States*, *supra*, at 144 U.S. 309, 12 S. Ct. 617. Defendants proceed from that well-established principle to assert that there was no such independent evidence here, or, in the alternative, that if there was independent evidence it was insufficient to validate the admission of Bombacino's testimony.

*Id.* at 283. Rejecting this argument, the court noted that although courts have admitted such evidence on a theory that the defendant's inculpatory statements constituted admissions against interest and hence were admissible in themselves,

the better view is that such admissions are not hearsay at all and are admissible absent other reasons for exclusion. . . . As evidence independent of the hearsay statement of a co-conspirator, such admissions may quite properly constitute corroborative evidence sufficient to justify the admission of a co-conspirator's hearsay declarations.

*Id.* at 284.

In *U.S. v. Cirillo* (2nd Cir. 1974), 499 F.2d 872, the court concluded that the non-hearsay evidence of a conspiracy, the principal item of which was a "devastatingly incriminatory telephone conversation" with the defendant, *id.* at 884, was sufficient to admit hearsay statements of co-conspirators. In *U.S. v. Rodriguez* (5th Cir. 1975), 509 F.2d 1342, the rule is encapsulated in the following extract:

Appellant first contends that extrajudicial statements made by co-defendants Castro, Arteaga, and Yepez, outside the presence of the appellant were improperly admitted into evidence. We hold that these statements, although hearsay, were properly admitted as declarations of co-conspirators made during the course of the conspiracy and in furtherance of it.

Of course, the government must introduce sufficient independent [sic] evidence of the existence of a conspiracy and of appellant's participation therein before the judge may allow declarations of the co-conspirator, made outside of the presence of the defendant, to go to the jury. *United States v. Apollo*, 476 F.2d 156, 157 (5th Cir. 1973); *Montford v. United States*, 200 F.2d 759, 760 (5th Cir. 1952). The test of sufficiency

is whether the other evidence, *aliunde* the hearsay, would be sufficient to support a finding that the defendant himself is a conspirator — that is, whether the government has established a *prima facie* case of the existence of a conspiracy and of defendant's participation therein. *United States v. Oliva*, 497 F.2d 130, 132-33 (5th Cir. 1974).

The trial judge properly required that the government show the appellant's participation in the conspiracy by evidence other than hearsay before allowing the jury to hear any of the extrajudicial statements of the co-conspirators. *The government met this burden by having Agent Scrocca describe the July 16, 1971 meeting with Rodriguez (i.e., the defendant). The judge then held that the government had made a sufficient showing that Rodriguez was a member of the conspiracy.* We believe the judge's ruling that sufficient evidence of a conspiracy and of defendant's participation therein had been presented was correct (emphasis added).

*Id.* at 1346.

We conclude from these authorities, as well as from the logic of the problem, that the non-hearsay admissions against interest of the defendant may be considered as establishing the "independent proof" of the conspiracy necessary to satisfy the requirements of Evid. R. 801 (D) (2) (e), removing from hearsay disabilities the statements of co-conspirators made during the course and in furtherance of a conspiracy. What, after all, is more persuasive or reliable evidence of the existence of a conspiracy than the admission by the defendant, freely and voluntarily given, that such conspiracy did in fact exist and included her among its members?

Finally, the defendant argues under her third assignment of error, that since at least some of the statements

of the co-conspirators were made after the conspiracy had arguably terminated, they were not made "during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy" within the meaning of Evid. R. 801(D) (2) (e).<sup>4</sup> This argument was, however, addressed by the Supreme Court in *State v. Shelton* (1977), 51 Ohio St. 2d 68, 364 N.E.2d 1152, *vacated on other grounds* (1978), 438 U.S. 909, 98 S. Ct. 3133, where the syllabus holds:

1. A conspiracy to commit a crime does not necessarily end with the commission of the crime.
2. A declaration of a conspirator, made subsequent to the actual commission of the crime, may be admissible against any co-conspirator if it was made while the conspirators were still concerned with the concealment of their criminal conduct or their identity.

We find this statement of the law necessarily dispositive of all of the instances of statements by co-conspirators cited by the defendant, at least up to the point where each of the two co-conspirators made their formal taped confessions approximately a day and one-half after the homicide.<sup>5</sup> Until that point, both Goerler and Catherine Duerr were still obviously concerned with the concealment of their criminal conduct. All such statements, which include nearly all

---

<sup>4</sup> The defendant also argues that the *crime* of conspiracy terminates when its objects are committed. R.C. 2923.01. This is offered to supplement the thrust of the above quoted language of Evid. R. 801(D)(2) (e), but has, in fact, no bearing on the instant issue. The defendant was not indicted for the specific crime of "conspiracy" as defined in R.C. 2923.01, nor tried under its provisions. The question, rather, involves the common law concepts of conspiracy as that word is used in the evidence rules in question.

<sup>5</sup> But see P. Giannelli, *Ohio Evidence Manual* § 801.15 at 15-16 (1982), for contrasting federal rule.

of those instanced to us by the defendant, were therefore either made during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy, or were made while the conspirators were still concerned with concealment of their criminal conduct.

The only "statements" of the co-conspirators cited to us by the defendant that might arguably lie beyond the obvious scope of *Shelton* occurred during the rebuttal testimony of Lt. Hulgin. A review of the record reveals that the following was the extent of that testimony:

Q. Officer, would you again state your name and spell your last name?

A. My name is Raymond Hulgin, H-u-l-g-i-n.

Q. And you were previously sworn in this same cause, officer, if you remember.

Officer, directing your attention again to the evening of May 20 and early morning hours of May 21, 1981, did you have an occasion to take a statement from Dennis Goerler?

A. Yes, sir, I did.

Q. And at any point did you advise Mr. Goerler of his constitutional and Miranda rights?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And when did you take a statement from him in relation to that fact?

A. In relation to advising him of his rights?

Q. Yes.

A. His statement was taken immediately following the advice of his rights.

Q. What happened after that statement was concluded?

A. Dennis Goerler was placed under arrest and charged with aggravated murder.

Q. And what happened to him physically after being placed under arrest?

A. He was processed as a prisoner; that is, he was fingerprinted and photographed and the necessary paperwork was made out concerning the charges placed against him.

Q. Did he remain in the custody of the Hamilton County sheriff at that time?

A. Yes, he did.

Q. And does he so remain even until today?

A. Yes, he is.

MR. MOOREHEAD: Thank you very much, officer. No further questions.

T.p. 621-622.<sup>6</sup>

It is immediately apparent that no "statement" of the co-conspirator, Goerler, was introduced or attempted, merely the *fact* of its having been taken, a fact which required precedent *Miranda* warnings and occasioned his subsequent arrest and detainment. The defendant argues that the jury may well have drawn invidious conclusions from this recitation, but that is not to argue that the testimony of Lt. Hulgin was inadmissible under Evid. R. 801(D)(2)(e), the challenge posed by the assignment of error. It was not so inadmissible; the testimony does not relate an out-of-court statement at all.

---

<sup>6</sup> We find no specific objection to this testimony in the record. There was considerable argument centering on Evid. R. 801(D)(2)(e) in connection with a Rule 29 motion at the conclusion of the state's case, renewed at the end of all the evidence, but no attempt to relate the above rebuttal testimony directly to that argument.

The defendant's third assignment of error is overruled,  
and the judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

DOAN and KLUSMEIER, JJ., CONCUR.

*PLEASE NOTE:*

The Court has placed of record its own entry in this case  
on the date of the release of this Opinion.

## APPENDIX B

---

THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

1983 TERM

To wit: March 9, 1983

---

No. 83-57

---

THE STATE OF OHIO      )

)

City of Columbus.      )

---

State of Ohio,

Appellee,

vs.

Carol Duerr and Catherine Duerr,

Appellants.

---

### APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR HAMILTON COUNTY

This cause, here on appeal as of right from the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County, was considered in the manner prescribed by law, and, no motion to dismiss such appeal having been filed, the Court sua sponte dismisses the appeal for the reason that no substantial constitutional question exists herein.

It is further ordered that a copy of this entry be certified to the Clerk of the Court of Appeals for Hamilton County for entry.

[CERTIFICATION OMITTED]

THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO  
1983 TERM

To wit: March 9, 1983

-----  
No. 83-57  
-----

THE STATE OF OHIO      )  
                            )  
City of Columbus.        )  
                            )

-----  
State of Ohio,

Appellee,  
vs.

Carol Duerr and Catherine Duerr.

Appellants.  
-----

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL FROM THE  
COURT OF APPEALS FOR HAMILTON COUNTY**

It is ordered by the Court that this motion is overruled.  
**COSTS:**

Motion Fee, \$20.00, paid by H. Fred Hoefle.

[CERTIFICATION OMITTED]